

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/620,138	07/14/2003	Mark A. Poland	494	8464		
28782 7	590 04/16/2004		EXAMINER			
WILLIAM E HEIN PO BOX 335			PRICE, RICHAR	PRICE, RICHARD THOMAS JR		
	CO 80539-0335	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3643	3643			

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Annlingtin	- No	Applicant(s)			
		Application						
		10/620,138	3	MARK A. POLAND				
Office Action Summary			Examiner		Art Unit			
			Thomas F		3643			
The MAILIN Period for Reply	IG DATE of this commun	nication app	ears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress		
THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS - If the period for reply sp - If NO period for reply is - Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the	TATUTORY PERIOD F TE OF THIS COMMUN be available under the provisions from the mailing date of this com- recified above is less than thirty (3 specified above, the maximum st he set or extended period for reply the Office later than three months sustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. 30) days, a reply tatutory period w y will, by statute,	36(a). In no ever within the statut will apply and will cause the applic	ort, however, may a reply be time ory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status								
1)⊠ Responsive	to communication(s) file	ed on <i>16 Ma</i>	arch 2004.					
2a) ☐ This action is	* *	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is no	n-final.				
<u>'</u>	,—							
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims	5							
4a) Of the ab 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>9-1</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s)	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 9-15 is/are rejected. ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Application Papers								
9) The specifica	ation is objected to by th	ne Examiner	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119							
a) All b) 1. Certifi 2. Certifi 3. Copie applic	ment is made of a claim Some * c) None of: ed copies of the priority ed copies of the priority s of the certified copies ation from the Internationed detailed Office action	documents documents of the prior	s have beer s have beer rity docume u (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicati nts have been receive 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References				4) Interview Summary				
Notice of Draftsperso Information Disclosur Paper No(s)/Mail Dat		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/620,138

Art Unit: 3643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadletz et al '439 in view of Williams '931.

Kadletz teaches a fish skinning and scaling device which is structurally similar to the Applicant's claimed shelling tool. More specifically, the shelling tool having a handle B4 and an elongate rod (A6 and D) extending away from the handle, a longitudinal slit is formed between a' and d' that extends inwardly from a distal end thereof. The slit defines an upper rod fork and a lower rod fork of said elongate rod. The slit of Kadletz et al forms a knife for slitting the skin of a fish. However, Kadletz et al do not discuss using the device for shelling a crustacean to permit removal of meat from a tail shell thereof. Williams teaches a hand operated crab leg opener with multiangled blade and a method thereof. Specifically, Williams teaches removing or separating a head/body portion of a crustacean from the tail shell, and sliding a upper and lower rod fork into an open end of said tail shell along an inside surface of an underside of said tail shell. The tool can further be rotated about a longitudinal axis thereof to produce a crack in said underside of said tail shell. Regarding claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the device of Kadletz

Art Unit: 3643

et al in such a way, in view of the teachings of Williams, in order to obtain meat from a crustacean. As for claim 10, the combination of Kadletz as modified by Williams, teaches rotating the device to produce a crack in the shell of the crustacean, although does not mention the specific angle. The Examiner believes that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would rotate the hand tool thru a variety of angles including 90 degrees, depending on the stiffness or rigidity of the shell and the desired crack to obtain the meat in the shell. In regards to claim 12, the tool includes a tether b and a finger ring A5. Regarding claims 14 and 15, the combination of Kadletz et al as modified by Williams teaches using the device on a lobster or crawfish, additionally, both are considered to be structurally equivalent.

Conclusion

Summary: Claims 1-8 are directed to a non-elected invention, while claims 9-15 have been rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Price whose telephone number is 703-308-2694. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30a.m. to 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/620,138

Art Unit: 3643

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas Price

Primary Examiner GAU: 3643

rtp